SUBJECTS.

Dewan's reply.—The proposal was considered in 1906 by the High Court, who recorded the opinion that the system would not work well in Travancore. The High Court will again be asked.

1. *Civil suits relating to viruthi lands.*

Mr. K. Raman Tampi (Member, Vilavankode Taluk) stated that the Civil Courts were at present insisting on Government being impleaded as a party in suits relating to lands which originally were of viruthi tenure. By joining the Sirkar as a party, the suits had to be filed in the District Courts, as they were not cognisable by the Munsiffs' Courts. Viruthi lands were being alienated in practice as much as pandarapattom lands and the treatment accorded at the settlement to the lands of both description was also the same. In the majority of cases, the ryots were put to the necessity of resorting to Civil Courts to set aside the decisions of the settlement officers in registration cases, and under the existing practice it took a long time before a suit could be filed in the Courts. He therefore prayed that the rule or practice which required that Government should be added as a party in such cases might be cancelled.

Dewan's reply.—The law as it stands does not require that the Government should be made a party in such cases. But under Section 7 A of the Civil Procedure Code, an order of Government permitting the party to seek redress in the Civil Courts is necessary before a suit can be filed. The matter will be enquired into.

2. *Procedure in cases of attachment of movables.*

Mr. A. E. Padmanabha Kurup (Member, Karunagapalli Taluk) said that, in cases of attachment of movables in execution of the decree of a Civil Court, the practice now was to entrust such movables to the care of the Amins of the Court till the auction was concluded or the articles were returned to the owners in case the decree was satisfied. The mischief practised by the Amins, who were a set of low-paid subordinates, caused much loss to the parties. The lists prepared by them were not being attested by anybody. In many cases, therefore, no accurate or exhaustive lists were prepared, properties were undervalued and non-perishable articles were entered as perishables. In view to remedy this state of affairs, it was desirable that three copies of the lists of properties should be prepared at the place of attachment and attested by the plaintiff, defendant, thadasthers and the Amin, and one copy furnished to the owner of the properties, one filed in the Court and one kept in the possession of the Amin. The Member said that a Circular to the above effect from the High Court would remove the difficulties complained of.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly